

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 5-8, 10, 11, 13-16, 20-23, 25, 26, and 28-30 will remain pending in this application. Claims 2-4, 9, 12, 17-19, 24 and 27 are hereby cancelled. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added by the present amendment.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 16, 17, 20-22, 26, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 7,120,606 (“Ranzini”) in view of United States Patent No. 6,856,686 (“DiSanto”). Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18, 19, 23-25, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ranzini in view of DiSanto and further in view of United States Patent No. 7,103,574 (“Peinado”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Interview Summary

Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Bandon Hoffman participated in a telephonic interview on January 29, 2008 during which the above claim amendments were discussed. Agreement was reached, and Examiner Hoffman stated that the above claim amendments appeared to overcome the rejections of record.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 16, 17, 20-22, 26, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 7,120,606 (“Ranzini”) in view of United States Patent No. 6,856,686 (“DiSanto”). Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18, 19, 23-25, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ranzini in view of DiSanto and further in view of United States Patent No. 7,103,574 (“Peinado”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1, 11, 16 and 26 recite a custom data portion having protected content and comprising rights data relating to the protected content. The rights data sets forth each entity that has rights with respect to the protected content, and for each such entity a description of such rights. The rights data also includes a decryption key, which is encrypted according to a rights management server’s private key.

The Office Action, with respect to former claims 3 and 18, states that “Ranzini as modified by DiSanto does not teach wherein the protected content in the custom data portion is encrypted according to a cryptographic key, and the rights data includes a decryption key for decrypting the content.” Rather, the Office Action cites Peinado (Col. 6. ll. 48-52, Col. 7, ll. 4-10, Col. 23, ll. 29-35) as allegedly teaching these features and also the additional features recited in former claim 4 (e.g., that the encryption key is decrypted according to a rights management server’s private key). The cited portions of Peinado disclose that protected content may be encrypted, that a decryption key for the content may be stored in a license, and that the decryption key in the license may be encrypted with a black box public key. Peinado does not, however, teach or suggest that the decryption key is stored in a custom data portion of a document that includes the encrypted content. Rather, in Peinado the decryption key is stored in the license. Peinado also does not teach or suggest that the decryption key in the custom data portion of the document may be encrypted with a rights management server public key that may be forwarded to the rights management server along with rights data, thereby enabling the rights management server to decrypt the encryption key if appropriate.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest “wherein the protected content in the custom data portion is encrypted according to a cryptographic key, the rights data including a decryption key for decrypting the encrypted content, the decryption key being encrypted according to a public key of the rights management server to result in an encrypted decryption key, the rights management server accessing the decryption key from the encrypted decryption key with a corresponding private key if the recipient is enabled by the rights data,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 16 or corresponding language from claims 11 and 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 11, 16 and 26 all claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: 304790.1 / MSFT-2151
Application No.: 10/607,627
Office Action Dated: November 30, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: February 29, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439